

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-33 are pending in the application. Claims 24-26 and 28-33 have been canceled. New claims 34 and 35 have been added and claims 1, 19, 21, 22 and 27 have been amended.

### **Period for Reply**

In response to a Final Office Action (January 15, 2004), applicants filed a Reply within two months of the mailing date of the final Office Action. The Reply was filed on March 15, 2004. An Advisory Action was mailed on May 27, 2004. The Advisory Action states that the period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. Applicants believe that the wrong box was checked by the Office with respect to the period for reply. Instead of box A, box B should have been checked indicating that the period for reply expires on the mailing date of the Advisory Action or the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later because the Reply was filed within two months of the final rejection. Applicants have calculated the extension fee accordingly from the date of the Advisory Action. Hence, a petition for a two-month extension of time and fee is included herewith. If the Office determines that an extension or other relief is required, applicants hereby petition for any required relief including extensions of time.

### **Request To Enter Reply After Final**

In response to the Final Office Action (January 15, 2004), applicants filed a Reply on March 15, 2004. This Reply was considered by the Examiner in an Advisory Action but was not entered because it was not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal. Applicants respectfully request entry of the Reply dated March 15, 2004 in its entirety including the amendments and arguments contained therein as they are responsive to the rejections contained in the Final Office Action. Amendments to the claims in the present Paper are presented as if the Reply dated March 15, 2004 has been entered.

### **The Present Amendment**

Following receipt of the Advisory Action, a telephone interview with the Examiner was held on June 23, 2004. In response, applicants have amended claims 1, 19, 21, 22 and 27 to clarify the invention. New dependent claims 34 and 35 have also been added. No new matter has been added. Also, applicants believe that the amendments and arguments contained in the Reply dated March 15, 2004 address the merits of the rejections of the Final Office Action in all respects and respectfully request entry of that Reply in addition to the amendments contained in this Paper. The amendments to claims 1, 19, 21, 22 and 27 contained in this Paper are believed to clarify the invention sufficiently to place them in a condition for allowance. For these reasons, applicants believe that the application is in a condition for allowance, and action toward that end is earnestly solicited.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 13, 2004

By:



Rimas T. Lukas  
Registration No. 46,451

Lukas IP Group  
P.O. Box 3295  
Half Moon Bay, California 94019-3295  
Telephone: (650) 560-0076  
Facsimile: (650) 897-9944